TV0- 386 Rã Conspiden

COMMUNICATION FROM: Jim Pendergast DATE 8-8-88 Time	2000000	MAHONE CALL DISCUSSION	FIELO TRIP CONFERENCE
South Cavalcade files South Cavalcade files Jim Pendergast Jenedal And PHEA assumptions Josepha Scalar Andergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Josepha Scalar Andergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Josepha Scalar Andergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Josepha Scalar Andergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Josepha Scalar Andergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast Jim Pendergast	RECORD OF COMMUNICATION	OTHER (SPECIFY)	
South Cavalcade files Jim Pendergast Jim Pen		<u></u>	
South Cavalcade files Jim Pendergast THE Re: Phone Call with Shannon Craig on Remedial Goals/Plans for Soils MHARY OF COMMUNICATION I talked with Shannon Craig of Keystone about the remedial goals and PHEA assumptions. First, I told her that my objection with the onsite commercial occupant scenario is the 3% factor to adjust for the fraction of the site which is contaminated compared to the fraction used for commercial activities. My problem is that this factor weights the site as a whole whereas the exposure is business specific. I told her that I could only support a fraction which is the highest for all onsite businesses. This is Palletized with a factor of 13%. Shannon agreed. Second, based on the above discussion, I told her that the PHEA supports a 10 ⁻⁵ risk level of 1060 ppm carcinogenic PAHs for the onsite commercial scenario. However, the scenario driving the risk is the one for future potential construction workers for continued development is not very likely without a complete destruction of the existing structures. Also, the type of construction may not take as long as estimated in the PHEA, nor may it be as intrusive as expected. Therefore, a 10 ⁻⁷ risk could be borne by this group which results in a 700 ppm carcinogenic PAH level. She agreed that Koppers could live with 700 ppm. We recognized that the actual measure driving soil remediation is the leaching potential. The Keystone treatability test showed leaching down to 140 ppm total PAHs. Therefore, the risk-based cleanup levels are probably higher than a leaching-based level. Last, we discussed the remedial action for soils. Shannon indicated that Koppers would support an in situ method because it would be effective, would work with the groundwater contamination offsite. I told her that EPA would be looking at another remedy in this area, most likely an excavation one because the in situ fixation and cap is 4 times as expensive. CONCLUSIONS, ACTION TAKEN ON REQUIRED.	D:	FROM:	1 ' '
Re: Pnone Call with Shannon Craig on Remedial Goals/Plans for Soils NAMANY OF COMMUNICATION I talked with Shannon Craig of Keystone about the remedial goals and PHEA assumptions. First, I told her that my objection with the onsite commercial occupant scenario is the 3% factor to adjust for the fraction of the site which is contaminated compared to the fraction used for commercial activities. My problem is that this factor weights the site as a whole whereas the exposure is business specific. I told her that I could only support a fraction which is the highest for all onsite businesses. This is Palletized with a factor of 13%. Shannon agreed. Second, based on the above discussion, I told her that the PHEA supports a 10 ⁻⁵ risk level of 1060 ppm carcinogenic PAMs for the onsite commercial scenario. However, the scenario driving the risk is the one for future potential construction workers (for continued development of the site in the areas of contamination). We agreed that this type of development is not very likely without a complete destruction of the existing structures. Also, the type of construction may not take as long as estimated in the PHEA, nor may it be as intrusive as expected. Therefore, a 10 ⁻ risk could be borne by this group which results in a 700 ppm carcinogenic PAM level. She agreed that Koppers could live with 700 ppm. We recognized that the actual measure driving soil remediation is the leaching potential. The Keystone treatability test showed leaching down to 140 ppm total PAMs. Therefore, the risk-based cleanup levels are probably higher than a leaching-based level. Last, we discussed the remedial action for soils. Shannon indicated that Koppers would support an in situ method because it would be effective, would work with the groundwater remedy, and would be the lowest cost. She understood my resvaritions about the Palletized property and the potential for an in situ process driving the groundwater contamination offsite. I told her that EPA would be looking at another remedy in thi	South Cavalcade files	Jim Pendergast	
I talked with Shannon Craig of Keystone about the remedial goals and PHEA assumptions. First, I told her that my objection with the onsite commercial occupant scenario is the 3% factor to adjust for the fraction of the site which is contaminated compared to the fraction used for commercial activities. My problem is that this factor weights the site as a whole whereas the exposure is business specific. I told her that I could only support a fraction which is the highest for all onsite businesses. This is Palletized with a factor of 13%. Shannon agreed. Second, based on the above discussion, I told her that the PHEA supports a 1c ⁻⁵ risk level of 1060 ppm carcinogenic PAHs for the onsite commercial scenario. However, the scenario driving the risk is the one for future potential construction workers (for continued development of the site in the areas of contamination). We greed that this type of development is not very likely without a complete destruction of the existing structures. Also, the type of construction may not take as long as estimated in the PHEA, nor may it be as intrusive as expected. Therefore, a 10 risk could be borne by this group which results in a 700 ppm carcinogenic PAH level. She agreed that Koppers could live with 700 ppm. We recognized that the actual measure driving soil remediation is the leaching potential. The keystone treatability test showed leaching down to 140 ppm total PAHs. Therefore, the risk-based cleanup levels are probably higher than a leaching-based level. Last, we discussed the remedial action for soils. Shannon indicated that Koppers would support an in situ method because it would be effective, would work with the groundwater remedy, and would be the lowest cost. She understood my reservations about the Palletized property and the potential for an in situ process driving the groundwater contamination offsite. I told her that EPA would be looking at another remedy in this area, most likely an excavation one because the in situ fixation and cap is 4 times as expensive.	UBJECT		
I talked with Shannon Graig of Keystone about the remedial goals and PHEA assumptions. First, I told her that my objection with the onsite commercial occupant scenario is the 3% factor to adjust for the fraction of the site which is contaminated compared to the fraction used for commercial activities. My problem is that this factor weights the site as a whole whereas the exposure is business specific. I told her that I could only support a fraction which is the highest for all onsite businesses. This is Palletized with a factor of 13%. Shannon agreed. Second, based on the above discussion, I told her that the PHEA supports a 10 ⁻⁵ risk level of 1060 ppm carcinogenic PAHs for the onsite commercial scenario. However, the scenario driving the risk is the one for future potential construction workers (for continued development of the site in the areas of contamination). We agreed that this type of development is not very likely without a complete destruction of the existing structures. Also, the type of construction may not take as long as estimated in the PHEA, nor may it be as intrusive as expected. Therefore, a 10 risk could be borne by this group which results in a 760 ppm carcinogenic PAH level. She agreed that Koppers could live with 700 ppm. Me recognized that the actual measure driving soil remediation is the leaching potential. The Keystone treatability test showed leaching down to 140 ppm total PAHs. Therefore, the risk-based cleanup levels are probably higher than a leaching-based level. Last, we discussed the remedial action for soils. Shannon indicated that Koppers would support an in situ method because it would be effective, would work with the groundwater remedy, and would be the lowest cost. She understood my reservations about the Palletized property and the potential for an in situ process driving the groundwater contamination offsite. I told her that EPA would be looking at another remedy in this area, most likely an excavation one because the in situ fixation and cap is 4 times as expensive		on Remedial Goals/Plans	for Soils
the 3% factor to adjust for the fraction of the site which is contaminated compared to the fraction used for commercial activities. My problem is that this factor weights the site as a whole whereas the exposure is business specific. I told her that I could only support a fraction which is the highest for all onsite businesses. This is Palletized with a factor of 13%. Sharnon agreed. Second, based on the above discussion, I told her that the PHEA supports a 1c ⁻⁵ risk level of 1060 ppm carcinogenic PAHs for the onsite commercial scenario. However, the scenario driving the risk is the one for future potential construction workers (for continued development of the site in the areas of contamination). We agreed that this type of development is not very likely without a complete destruction of the existing structures. Also, the type of construction may not take as long as estimated in the PHEA, nor may it be as intrusive as expected. Therefore, a 10° risk could be borne by this group which results in a 700 ppm carcinogenic PAH level. She agreed that Koppers could live with 700 ppm. We recognized that the actual measure driving soil remediation is the leaching potential. The Keystone treatability test showed leaching down to 140 ppm tetal PAHs. Therefore, the risk-based cleanup levels are probably higher than a leaching-based level. Last, we discussed the remedial action for soils. Shannon indicated that Koppers would support an in situ method because it would be effective, would work with the groundwater remedy, and would be the lowest cost. She understood my reservations about the Palletized property and the potential for an in situ process driving the groundwater contamination offsite. I told her that EPA would be looking at another remedy in this area, most likely an excavation one because the in situ fixation and cap is 4 times as expensive. CONCLUSIONS, ACTION TAKEN OR REQUIRED		ystone about the remedia	l goals and PHEA assumptions.
level of 1060 ppm carcinogenic PAHs for the onsite commercial scenario. However, the scenario driving the risk is the one for future potential construction workers (for continued development of the site in the areas of contamination). We agreed that this type of development is not very likely without a complete destruction of the existing structures. Also, the type of construction may not take as long as estimated in the PHEA, nor may it be as intrusive as expected. Therefore, a 10 risk could be borne by this group which results in a 700 ppm carcinogenic PAH level. She agreed that Koppers could live with 700 ppm. We recognized that the actual measure driving soil remediation is the leaching potential. The Keystone treatability test showed leaching down to 140 ppm total PAHs. Therefore, the risk-based cleanup levels are probably higher than a leaching-based level. Last, we discussed the remedial action for soils. Shannon indicated that Koppers would support an in situ method because it would be effective, would work with the groundwater remedy, and would be the lowest cost. She understood my reservations about the Palletized property and the potential for an in situ process driving the groundwater contamination offsite. I told her that EPA would be looking at another remedy in this area, most likely an excavation one because the in situ fixation and cap is 4 times as expensive. CONCLUSIONS, ACTION TAKEN OR REQUIRED Look for the above discussion reflected in the final FS report and PHEA.	the 3% factor to adjust for the 1 to the fraction used for commerci weights the site as a whole where that I could only support a fract	Fraction of the site which ial activities. My probl was the exposure is busing tion which is the highest	h is contaminated compared em is that this factor ess specific. I told her for all onsite businesses.
potential. The Keystone treatability test showed leaching down to 140 ppm total PAHs. Therefore, the risk-based cleanup levels are probably higher than a leaching-based level. Last, we discussed the remedial action for soils. Shannon indicated that Koppers would support an in situ method because it would be effective, would work with the groundwater remedy, and would be the lowest cost. She understood my reservations about the Palletized property and the potential for an in situ process driving the groundwater contamination offsite. I told her that EPA would be looking at another remedy in this area, most likely an excavation one because the in situ fixation and cap is 4 times as expensive. CONCLUSIONS. ACTION TAKEN OR REQUIRED Look for the above discussion reflected in the final FS report and PHEA.	level of 1060 ppm carcinogenic PA scenario driving the risk is the continued development of the site type of development is not very structures. Also, the type of copHEA, nor may it be as intrusive by this group which results in a	Als for the onsite commer one for future potential in the areas of contamilikely without a complete postruction may not take as expected. Therefore,	cial scenario. However, the construction workers (for nation). We agreed that this destruction of the existing as long as estimated in the a 10 destruction of the borne
would support an in situ method because it would be effective, would work with the groundwater remedy, and would be the lowest cost. She understood my reservations about the Palletized property and the potential for an in situ process driving the groundwater contamination offsite. I told her that EPA would be looking at another remedy in this area, most likely an excavation one because the in situ fixation and cap is 4 times as expensive. CONCLUSIONS. ACTION TAKEN OR REQUIRED Look for the above discussion reflected in the final FS report and PHEA. INFORMATION COPIES TO:	potential. The Keystone treatab Therefore, the risk-based cleanup	ility test showed leachir	ig down to 140 ppm total PAHs.
Look for the above discussion reflected in the final FS report and PHEA. INFORMATION COPIES TO:	would support an in situ method be groundwater remedy, and would be about the Palletized property and groundwater contamination offsite remedy in this area, most likely	because it would be effect the lowest cost. She ur d the potential for an ir e. I told her that EPA w	ctive, would work with the iderstood my reservations is situ process driving the would be looking at another
INFORMATION COPIES TO:	CONCLUSIONS, ACTION TAKEN OR REQUIRED		
10:	Look for the above discussion re	flected in the final FS r	report and PHEA.
10:			
10:			
10:			
10:			
10:			
10:		The second secon	The state of the s
10:	SHEGHMATION COPIES		A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O
		•	
ps_123 (2-84)			
KI) - 123 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	R6-123 (2-84)		. ئىدە